DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 368 934 CE 066 245

AUTHOR Putnam, A. R.
TITLE Conference Program Analysis. Technology Education Division.
PUB DATE [Dec 93]
NOTE 6p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Conferences; *Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; Models; *Pilot Projects; Postsecondary Education; *Program Evaluation; *Questionnaires; Research Methodology; Technology Education

ABSTRACT

A pilot project attempted to measure reactions of participants to the Technology Education Division program at the national convention of the American Vocational Association in St. Louis (December 1992). After a review of the literature, a Conference Reaction Model was developed and subjected to peer review. After several revisions, a pilot instrument was developed and distributed to approximately 350 conference participants, with 127 completed returns received. More than half of the respondents listed "ideas for future action" as the primary reason for attending a session, and 85 percent were satisfied or very satisfied with the session. More than 60 percent of all respondents were satisfied with the conference program; reactions to the general sessions were the most varied. However, great variability existed between reaction to different speakers and programs in the same session. The most common complaint was individual presenters' lack of organization. It was recommended that this problem be addressed by requiring more complete organization from those programs early in the planning process. (The Conference Reaction Model and evaluation sheet are included in the report.) (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 368 934

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Conference Program Analysis
Technology Education Division
American Vocational Association
Report of a pillot project by
A.R. Putnam
T.E.D. Research Committee Chair

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A R Putnam

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A pilot project to attempt measurement of reactions of participants to the Technology Education Division program at the national convention of the American Vocational Association at St. Louis, MO was undertaken last December at the suggestion of Dr. Mike Dyrenfurth, T.E.D. Program Chair for the convention. The following is a brief synopsis of methodology, analysis and results. I would be pleased to share data, analysis, or interpretation in detail upon request.

After analysis and resulting conclusions, the instrument was revised and 500 copies of the revised instrument have been prepared. Student manpower from my institution, however, is unavailable this year. Suggestions for or assistance with instrument distribution and collection would be welcomed.

After a review of the literature, a Conference Reaction Model was developed and subjected to peer review. After several revisions, it was determined to be adequate and instrument development was begun. The major requirement of the instrument would be to measure each element of the Conference Reaction Model at least once, be unambiguous and easily to use and easily subjected to statistical analysis. The literature was again reviewed, and a preliminary instrument was developed. With the assistance of several colleagues and after many revisions a satisfactory pilot instrument was developed.

The sample of sessions at which the instrument was used at the 1992 conference included a representative cross-section of general and special interest topics and was chosen by Dr. Dyrenfurth, program chair. Copies of the instrument were delivered to a total sample of 12 selected sessions on Friday, Saturday and Sunday by Indiana State University students recruited

CE 066 245

by the author. Instruments were distributed and collected by the session chairs and facilitators and returned to the author. Data were subjected to analysis using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, procedure CROSSTABS.

Of approximately 350 instruments distributed, 127 completed and usable copies from 7 different sessions were returned. Approximately 70% were from the first and second General Sessions. Other sessions included the TEDD/NAITTE Research Symposium, the Technology Education Demonstration Project Session, Carousel, Technological Literacy, and TED/NAITTE Graduate Student Research. 41.2% of those responding classified themselves as secondary teachers, and 37.8% as post-secondary teachers. 10.9% classified themselves as administrators, 1.7% as elementary teachers, and 8.4% as other.

Over half (56.6%) of all respondents listed "ideas for future action" as the primary reason for attending a session, and 85.2% were satisfied or very satisfied with the session. Over 70% of all respondents stated that the session attended was valuable to them and all (100%) of the respondents at the Carousel and Graduate Student Research found the session valuable.

Over 60% of all respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with the conference program. As could be expected, reactions to the General Sessions were the most varied. General satisfaction was expressed with the physical facilities. The two items receiving the greatest variability of response dealt with the TED Program Schedule of sessions, and organization of individual presenters. The high variability of response on those items suggests relatively high dissatisfaction by respondents.

After analysis and interpretation of data, the following recommendations are offered. As noted earlier, I would be pleased to share details of methodology, data, or analysis upon request.

1. Results of the pilot project were successful in yielding data extremely useful in planning future conferences. Systematic preparation for conference evaluation would result in more and better data. I there fore recommend that systematic evaluation of future conferences become routine, and I would be please to assist.

2. The sample of completed and usable instruments available for analysis was very disappointing. I believe that the sample rate could be greatly improved by developing and publicizing a standard system so that session chairs, facilitators, presenters, and participants are prepared for and expect measurement of conference reaction.

3. Great variability existed between reaction to different speakers and programs in the same session. This appeared to confuse and displease respondents and skew the measurement. It is recommended that efforts be made to increase the uniformity of programs within individual sessions in an attempt to address this concern.

4. Great variability of response to items addressing organization of individual presenters suggests respondent dissatisfaction. It is recommended that this be addressed by requiring more complete organization from those proposing programs early in the planning process.

CONFERENCE REACTION MODEL

FORMATIVE (Organization of T.E.D. Program)

Program Design
- Congruence with conference theme
- Scope of T.E.D. program
- Scheduling of T.E.D. program

Logistics
- Assigned room and arrangement
- Audio visual equipment
- Chair person/facilitator

SUMMATIVE (Presentation Evaluation)

Demographics
- Attendance
- Who attended
- Why

Content
- Congruence with T.E.D. goals
- Objectives developed
- Objectives accomplished

Process
- Presentation organization
- Presentation delivery
- Results (satisfaction index)

SESSION REACTION SHEET

Please return the completed form as you leave the room.

This reaction form is designed to collect your immediate reaction to the content and process of this session and your general feedback on the conference. Your feedback will be used to evaluate this conference and plan future ones.

Session # _____ **Session Title** _____

Circle the title that best describes you: Administrator Elementary teacher Secondary teacher Post-secondary teacher Other: (please specify)

Your Company or School: _____ **State:** _____

1. **What was your objective in attending this session?**
   ___ personal growth ___ ideas for future action ___ validate current activities
   ___ professional development ___ other: _____

2. **What benefits did you get from this session?**
   ___ new knowledge ___ specific approaches, skills or techniques ___ change in attitude
   ___ better understanding of Technology Education ___ other: _____

For the following, please circle the number corresponding to your opinion of the session

Strongly Agree = **1**, Agree = **2**, Undecided/Neutral = **3**, Disagree = **4**, and Strongly Disagree = **5**

3.	I was very interested in this subject	1 2 3 4 5
4.	The session chair/facilitator did a good job.	1 2 3 4 5
5.	The room was uncomfortable and/or poorly arranged	1 2 3 4 5
6.	This has been a very good conference	1 2 3 4 5
7.	Needed A.V. equipment was present and functioning	1 2 3 4 5
8.	This session "fits" the conference theme	1 2 3 4 5
9.	Few sessions at this conference have fit my needs	1 2 3 4 5
10.	It has been easy to attend most sessions that interest me	1 2 3 4 5
11.	I understood the objectives of this session	1 2 3 4 5
12.	The objectives of this session were accomplished	1 2 3 4 5
13.	The session content was valuable to me	1 2 3 4 5
14.	The speaker was not well organized	1 2 3 4 5
15.	Time was well used by this speaker	1 2 3 4 5
16.	The speaker was interesting	1 2 3 4 5
17.	The speaker was knowledgeable of the subject	1 2 3 4 5
18.	This has been a very good session	1 2 3 4 5

Additional Comments: